

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 219 484

UD 022.471

AUTHOR Ascher, Carol
TITLE Student Alienation, Student Behavior and the Urban Schools. ERIC/CUE Urban Diversity Series Number 82.
INSTITUTION Columbia Univ., New York, N.Y. Inst. for Urban and Minority Education; ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, New York, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Aug 82
CONTRACT 400-77-0071
NOTE 63p.
AVAILABLE FROM ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, Box 40, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027 (\$5.00).
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Administrator Role; Catholic Schools; *Educational Improvement; High Schools; High School Students; *Institutional Characteristics; *Minority Groups; Nontraditional Education; Private Schools; Public Schools; School Desegregation; *School Effectiveness; Social Change; *Student Alienation; Student Attitudes; Student Behavior; Student Characteristics; Teacher Role; *Urban Schools; *Values Education

ABSTRACT

This paper summarizes several research findings in order to determine the urban high school characteristics that are most likely to decrease alienation among inner city, minority students, and to make their attitudes toward education, themselves, and their futures more positive. First, the paper discusses the phenomenon of alienation in society and in the schools, and considers how attitudinal and behavioral signs of alienation are related to student achievement. The author then examines specific studies done in comprehensive high schools, desegregated schools, alternative schools, and private/Catholic schools to identify school characteristics and other factors that bring about student alienation, disruptive behavior, stress, and poor achievement, and the factors that make for positive student achievement and behavior in particular settings. A concluding summary of the points made throughout the literature review includes: (1) the suggestion that alienation is a broad category and must be used as a means of understanding otherwise isolated variables like student violence, dropout rates, and low achievement which point to the same underlying condition; (2) identification of organizational elements that foster alienation and those that decrease alienation; (3) identification of administrator, teacher, and student characteristics that contribute to improved schooling; and (4) emphasis on the importance of values in helping to decrease student alienation. (Author/MJL)

STUDENT ALIENATION, STUDENT BEHAVIOR

AND THE URBAN SCHOOLS

by

Carol Ascher
Research Associate
ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

ERIC/CUE Urban Diversity Series
Number 82, August 1982

ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education
Institute for Urban and Minority Education
Teachers College, Columbia University
New York, New York 10027

This publication is one in the ERIC/CUE Urban Diversity Series produced by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, with funding from the National Institute of Education, United States Department of Education (contract number A00-77-0071), and Teachers College, Columbia University. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the positions or policies of NIE or the Department of Education. Additional copies will be available from:

ERIC Document Reproduction Service
P.O. Box 190
Arlington, Virginia 22210

Its ED identification number and full ordering instructions will be found in RESOURCES IN EDUCATION, the monthly ERIC abstract journal, or can be obtained by contacting ERIC/CUE.

Copies are also available from The ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, Box 40, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York, 10027, for \$5.00 each.

Table of Contents

I.	Method.....	1
II.	Alienation in Society and the Schools.....	3
	The Relationship Between School Reform and Social Change.....	4
III.	The Importance of Attitudinal and Behavioral Signs of Alienation....	7
	Disregard for Alienation in Educational Research.....	8
	Relation of Alienation and Other Attitudes in Achievement.....	9
IV.	Comprehensive High Schools.....	13
	Fifteen Thousand Hours.....	16
	Commonalities and Differences in Findings.....	19
V.	Desegregated Comprehensive High Schools.....	20
	Alienation and Racial Mixing.....	21
	Desegregation and Student Disruption.....	23
	Desegregation and Stress.....	24
	Decreasing Alienation in Desegregated Schools.....	28
	Commonalities and Differences in Findings, and Unanswered Questions.....	30
VI.	Alternative Schools.....	32
	Three Studies.....	35
	Limitations and Promises of Alternative Education.....	38
VII.	Private Schools.....	39
	Public and Private Schools.....	40
	Nonalienating Schooling as Seen from Private Schools.....	42
	Catholic High Schools and Minority Students.....	45

Values and Alienation.....	48
VIII. Conclusion.....	49
Importance of the Whole Picture.....	49
Organizational Role in Decreasing Alienation.....	50
Principals, Teachers, and Students.....	51
Values.....	51
XI. References.....	53

I. METHOD

This paper attempts to answer a simple question: what high school characteristics are most likely to decrease the alienation of inner-city, working-class, minority students and to make their attitudes more positive toward education, themselves, and their futures? Clearly, modern urban life has many alienating aspects, and our urban schools are also affected. Yet because the ills of modernization do not fall uniformly on all schools, there is reason to search for those schools which minimize alienation.

As a research summary, this paper brings together notable studies as well as large-scale reviews of work done in several school settings: comprehensive high schools (not necessarily desegregated), desegregated high schools, alternative high schools, and private high schools. The aim of the paper is not to argue for one type of school over all others, but to show that certain school conditions may be associated with more positive student behaviors and attitudes. In fact, my assumption is that school diversity is a good in itself (students will always be far more diverse than schools are likely to be) and is here to stay, and that educational planners, administrators, teachers, and parents ought simply to be able to make choices based on consideration of the most recent and reliable research. This paper is directed, then, toward all those interested in what social scientists have recently had to say about the relationship between certain high school characteristics and

a variety of interrelated student behaviors and attitudes that can be seen as arising out of either alienation or its opposites--connectedness, engagement, and meaning.

It should be noted at the outset that the vast amount of literature in these areas of general, desegregated, alternative, and private schooling is by no means uniform in its subject matter. Nor does it originate in a common motivation, or follow a single methodology. In fact, each of the types of schooling has tended to create its characteristic slant or research focus. Desegregation research, while covering the methodological gamut, has generally been directed to answering one of two questions: Under what conditions does desegregation work? and Does desegregation improve the achievement of minority students? Perhaps because public high schools have been subjected to such a high degree of disruption, there is a growing body of general high school research focusing on school crime and violence. Recently two national studies of private schooling have been directed to giving scholarly support for a change in the structure of federal funding to public and private schools. Finally, as alternative schools have arisen out of the difficulties of the comprehensive public high schools, so the research on alternatives has been geared to discovering those differences which may hold youth and make them more diligent in their work.

The state of knowledge in education, as everywhere, is in constant flux. Our perspectives change in what is thought to be good schooling as well as what is considered reliable and effective research. This paper does not attempt to work statistical miracles on the existing studies with the hope of arriving at a numerically weighted ultimate "truth." Rather, the

literature is looked at in a narrative vein, with the pros and cons and nuances argued as the occasion arises in order to arrive at the best possible bunches for the future.

II. ALIENATION IN SOCIETY AND THE SCHOOLS

Social scientists and popular writers alike have viewed alienation--in its objective as well as subjective meanings--as a necessary by-product of modern society. Rationalization, specialization, and bureaucratization are all seen to bring with them powerlessness and anomie. Moreover, as Marxists have argued, there may be something about capitalism itself--the way it takes from the worker the control of both the work process and the product of his/her labor--that is objectively alienating, whether or not the individual experiences it as such. Roles and functions which fragment experience are by definition alienating. Certainly, modern urban society, both capitalist and socialist, has given rise to large, impersonal institutions. Human relationships have become objectively and subjectively alienating as numbers take the place of names, and standardized tests and measures are used as the most efficient (and seen as fair and even scientific) means of decision making.

Among the psychological manifestations of alienation are feelings of powerlessness, lack of control, meaninglessness, normlessness, and estrangement (Newmann 1981). These feelings are often cited as the hazards of large institutions, including big city schools. In alienating environments people are unlikely to arrive at an agreement about values that is possible in small institutions, or institutions developed out of strong unifying ideologies, such as religious schools. There is a question of

whether, or under what conditions, a multiethnic society with its many different norms and values also increases alienation. Students and even staff in large urban high schools filled with many potentially antagonized subgroups may comply with their schools' basic demands, but they do not necessarily cooperate to attain shared goals (Cusick 1973). As Friedenberg (1963) argued nearly two decades ago, because of our multiethnic environment, U.S. schools have established a low level of consensus that actually suits no one and may increase feelings of alienation, particularly among the rich, the poor, the gifted, and the handicapped. It is clear that many efforts at school improvement, such as reducing school size, increasing students' role in governance, individualizing instruction, and humanizing school climate, can be seen as attempts to reduce student alienation (Newmann 1981).

The Relationship Between School Reform And Social Change

Most educational reform and research contain assumptions, either explicit or implicit, about the relationship between improving schooling and changing society. Such was the initial dream, for example, of early desegregation efforts, or of school programs initiated in the "War on Poverty." School would be used to redress the inequities the rest of society had created. A number of theorists of education, however, have viewed schools as evolving passively in response to society's needs. In an interesting article which takes the position of such a fit between Schools and society, Grannis (1967) outlines three types of schools: the family school, generally associated with preschools and the primary grades and having its origins in the Progressive era; the factory school, the most prevalent type of elementary and secondary school today, which originated

in the cities of the late 19th century to prepare working-class youths for work; and the corporate school which, since the mid 1950s, has developed most rapidly in the suburbs, and whose function is primarily to inculcate in youths certain adaptations to a modern, bureaucratically organized society. Yet Grannis also sees these schools as outliving their era and the function for which they initially evolved. While the family model is inappropriate to the later grades, both the factory and corporate schools are too preoccupied with the accumulation of specialized knowledge and skills, and too little concerned with personal and social integration. For in a society that appears fragmented and disconnected, what the individual needs most, according to Grannis, is help in experiencing life as a whole and in understanding how to intervene in society in order to benefit from it or change it.

Interestingly, it is just this educational task of forging integration that Swidler (1979) sees as the promise of alternative education, as a model for the evolving structure of new complex organizations. Swidler's book is a close analysis of two alternative schools. In a concluding discussion which emphasizes parallels in structure and function between alternative education and the emerging organizational world in business and industry, Swidler argues that schools are not merely reflections of society, but can act as antennae pointing to change. "Although the small, almost primitive organizations of the counter-culture cannot serve as models for the systems of coordinated activity that are emerging at the frontiers of organizational change," she says, "their dilemmas prefigure many of the dilemmas of larger more complex systems of organization without authority" (p.176).

Finally, and most commonly in recent years, schools have been viewed as helpless to create change by comparison with other social forces and institutions. Researchers such as Coleman et al. (1966) and Jencks et al. (1972) were influential in the early 1970s with their stress on the salience of early environment and their consequent view of schools as largely powerless to alter the effects of racism and poverty on student achievement. Yet this pessimism about the possibility for any autonomous role for schooling has more recently spawned an "effective schooling" movement among a growing number of investigators who have tried to isolate the differences in schools that do exist and that alter their effectiveness in serving socioeconomically disadvantaged students. While the "effective schooling" literature focuses predominantly on elementary schools and on those school characteristics that foster achievement, its attempts to separate out those school qualities that do make a difference are instructive for the present paper.

The question of the constraints and limits in altering schooling within an existing but changing social world is ultimately a philosophical one whose answer depends in part on the predisposition of the individual and in part on the spirit of the era. Although social alienation may be acknowledged as a pervasive force in our society, and although this force may suggest limits to school improvement, there is little justification for abandoning the effort to create less alienating schools. As Newmann (1981, p.549) argues; "So long as there is some possibility of improving school life, the well-documented human need to diminish alienating experiences as much as possible establishes a moral obligation to work in that direction."

III. THE IMPORTANCE OF ATTITUDINAL AND BEHAVIORAL SIGNS OF ALIENATION

Like most sociological "facts," the existence of student alienation, particularly in urban high schools, has become common knowledge. Yet there have been no systematic national studies of student alienation. Still, reports on absenteeism, truancy, dropouts, declining achievement and vandalism lead to an image of students as estranged, apathetic, and often hostile (Abramowitz and Tenebaum 1972; Asner and Broschart 1978; Carnegie Council 1979; Office of Juvenile Justice 1980; and Stake and Easley 1978). The Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education began their 1979 report on the "youth problem" in the United States with a list of "problems that are not going away of their own accord" (p.1). Among these are a number which are clearly behavioral and attitudinal signs of alienation from schooling and society.

- The overall dropout rate from high school is 23 percent to 35 percent for blacks and 45 percent for Hispanics.
- Approximately 20 percent of all high school graduates have deficiencies in language and numerical skills.
- Nearly half of all high school students don't consider the work hard enough.
- More than 50 percent of all arrests are youths under 25, and nearly 25 percent are under 18.
- Even by traditional (conservative) measures, nearly 50 percent of all unemployment is accounted for by persons 24 and younger; some pockets of youths have unemployment rates of 60 percent or higher.
- Teenage pregnancy is on the rise; of the nonwhite females dropping out, 48 percent give marriage or pregnancy as the reason.

Focusing more directly on daily life within the high school itself, the Office of Juvenile Justice (1980) estimates the annual cost of school vandalism at \$200 million to \$600 million. Fifteen percent of the principals

serving big-city schools surveyed in a 1975-76 study considered crime and vandalism to be "serious" (Abramowitz and Tenenbaum 1978). According to an NIE report, "the risk of violence to teenage youngsters is greater in school than elsewhere" (Asner and Broschart 1978, p.15). This same report indicates that the less students value their teachers' opinions, the greater the property loss due to vandalism and burglary in the school.

Though the basing of state aid on reported attendance rates makes the reporting of truancy unreliable, the Carnegie Council (1979) asserts truancy may be a far better measure of student alienation from school than dropping out. A 1977 report by the Economic Council of New York City showed that in 15 schools where blacks were a majority of the student body, the average daily absence rate was 32 percent, and in five schools dominated by Puerto Ricans the rate was 38 percent. "The pervasiveness of the problem of absenteeism is indicated by the fact that 35 percent of public secondary school principals responding to a survey on serious problems in the schools identified absenteeism (absence for an entire day) as a 'very serious' or 'serious' problem" (quoted in Carnegie Council 1979, p.53).

Disregard for Alienation in Educational Research

Despite these concrete manifestations of student alienation, the bulk of educational research continues to be devoted to the narrow concern of student achievement. In particular, the burgeoning literature on effective schooling, largely focused on elementary students, has sought to identify school and classroom characteristics associated with increased academic learning of disadvantaged students. Except for some significant studies of the high school years, the behaviors and attitudes that may underly achievement, or equally important, behaviors that may be valuable in and of them-

selves, have been secondary if not altogether ignored.

There are important reasons for this disregard of the problems of alienation--reasons which also contribute to the alienation itself. For one, the domination of technology and specialization affect how schools are viewed as much as how they function. As Newmann (1981, p.560) notes:

The professional technological perspective is so rooted in specialization as the solution to human problems and so insistent upon value-neutrality, that the quality of life in school rarely becomes an important issue. Instead, issues are construed in the narrow sense of how to increase reading scores or how to prevent violence in the school, and solutions are sought through consultations with specialized experts rather than those interested in reducing alienation in general.

The related use of standardized tests as the predominant judge of achievement is also partly at fault for this bias toward a narrow vision of school success. Administrators of most American school systems have felt compelled to test their systems' success (or failure) with these instruments, despite the fact that their narrowness easily makes them party to perpetuating the very class and race inequities that schools may try to alleviate, and despite the fact that they describe a small part of what goes on in school and are certainly not equally accurate in measuring the success of an academic high school program and, say, a vocational program.

Relation of Alienation and Other Attitudes to Achievement

Clearly, attitudes and achievement are related in an individual's personality. Interventions which direct themselves to changing a student's attitude also lead indirectly to increasing his/her achievement, and vice versa (Schweinhart and Weikart 1980). Rutter et al. (1979), in their pathbreaking analysis of London secondary schools, found that those schools which yielded better examination scores also fostered better student

behavior and had lower delinquency rates. Similarly, Coleman et al. (1980) and Greeley (1982) draw links in the American private school context between student achievement, student self-concept, and the school's control over student discipline. Arnone and Strout (1978, p.10), in their analysis of alternative schooling, suggest a "causal chain of events" and, following Hirschi (1969), note the process "'from academic incompetence to poor school performance to disliking school to rejection of the school's authority, to commission of delinquent acts.'" Gold (1977, p.12) describes the connection between poor school achievement, low self-esteem and disruptive behavior in similar, but less causal, terms:

...poor scholastic performance measured by school grades and standardized achievement tests is related to low self-esteem measured by nonprojective and by projective means; and...poor scholastic performance is also related to disruptive, delinquent behavior in the school and in the community, whether that behavior is observed and rated by teachers or reported by the youngsters themselves. Furthermore, there is evidence that low self-esteem is associated with higher levels of delinquent behavior, and there is some indication that enhancing self-esteem will reduce that behavior.

According to Gold (1977) and others following him (Arnone and Strout 1978; Raywid 1981), disruptive behavior may be seen as an ego defense against threats to self-esteem. Such behavior is an attempt to protect the individual from a derogated self-image caused by failure in any one of the person's social roles; within the school setting the threat comes most often through the role of student. The findings of Elliot and Voss (quoted in Office of Juvenile Justice 1980, p.3) that delinquent youths who dropped out of school were more delinquent before they left school than after dropping out corroborates the likelihood that school experiences

themselves contribute to delinquent behavior. According to Arnone and Strout (1978, p.15), "It may be plausibly argued that one of the most promising approaches to remedying school vandalism and disruption is to improve students' self-concepts." They base their view largely on the findings of Massimo and Shore (1963) that delinquents enrolled in effective alternative education programs may improve first in self-image, next in control of aggression, and finally in attitudes toward authority.

There is a substantial literature directed to the relationship between teacher attitudes and student behavior, particularly on the effects of teachers' expectations for minority students on the students' achievement. An early and controversial work in this area was that of Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968), which attempted to show that teachers' expectations for their students, and thus their students' performance, were ultimately based on the students' skin color. This research was criticized for methodological problems (Thorndike 1968; Snow 1969). In addition, Rosenthal and Jacobson emphasized the power of teachers' expectations, and did not explore the creative power of the students' attitudes and abilities. As Schweinhart and Weikart (1980) have subsequently shown, when students do well academically or become more cooperative, they may raise parents' and teachers' expectations, which in turn leads to even greater changes in the students. The authors summarize the results of their eleven-year followup study as conveying a basic theme of "the relationship between commitment [to learning] and achievement" (p.87)--the former on the part of all those concerned. Rutter et al. (1979, p.181) posit the relationship between expectations and achievement as it occurred in their high school study:

The initial teaching task is shaped by the attitudes, behaviors, interests, and capabilities of the children in the class. Teacher actions then influence children's behavior, which in turn modifies teacher behavior, which then further impinges on the children. In this way, spirals of either improving or deteriorating behavior (and attainments) seems likely to be built.

As the preceding discussion indicates, student alienation can be expressed in disruptive and other disaffected behavior, in attitudes toward oneself (such as self-esteem) and toward others (such as toward schools and school people), and in academic achievement. The three variables--social (or antisocial) behavior, attitudes, and cognitive attainment--are related in any individual. Changing one is likely to create alterations in the other two.

Finally, as Levin (1976, p.269) notes, "Schools are expected to produce many outcomes in addition to increasing academic achievement." These include a variety of attitudes and social habits that will enable the individual to act as a responsible adult. Students' attitudes and behavior while in secondary school are indicative of their willingness to remain part of mainstream society. Alienated youth, particularly if they are from a working-class, minority background, are likely to be disaffected outsiders as adults. They will probably not give time and interest to voting and other positive forms of civic participation. Given the high rates of unemployment, these are the ones likely to become jobless, to rely on public assistance, or to fall prey to underground forms of self-support. Moreover, expressions of alienation tend to be encouraged and passed on from generation to generation through unattractive school environments, low-status jobs, poor housing, and unemployment. As the Carnegie Council (1979, p.4) warns, "We are in danger of developing a permanent underclass,

a self-perpetuating culture of poverty....We are in danger of creating a set of policies that provides a substantially free ride financially for many of the successful and permits, if it does not ensure, a bum's rush for the unsuccessful in the race for life chances."

IV. COMPREHENSIVE HIGH SCHOOLS

The most obvious and advanced manifestations of student alienation are the disruptive behaviors by which students tell each other and the school staff that they do not care about the school process. These verbal and nonverbal signals include misbehavior in class and in the halls, cutting and truancy, vandalism to school property, and in-school crime. Because comprehensive high schools have been plagued by concrete manifestations of student alienation, a significant body of literature on comprehensive secondary schools focuses on student disruption.

Several recent studies of urban high schools draw from either wide ranging surveys or small-scale research ideas for decreasing violence and disruption in secondary schools. They suggest that both community and school influences lie at the bottom of student disruption, and argue that among those variables over which schools have control are: school and student body size and management, material resources, and a variety of issues concerning authority and responsibility, although they differ in their emphases and solutions in each area.

In Disruption in 600 Schools, Gottfredson and Daiger (1979) base their findings about the causes of school violence on a national sample of secondary schools. Like most researchers, the authors note the importance of community influences (outside the school's control) on determining the

level of school violence. Unemployment, poverty, and a high percentage of female-headed households among the student body are all associated with increased incidence of violence, according to the sample.

As for the characteristics educators themselves can control, Gottfredson and Daiger find that large schools with limited resources experience the most severe problems. Size factors especially salient in combatting disruption are lowering total school enrollment and decreasing the number of different students taught by a typical teacher. For junior highs, particularly, small schools have fewer problems of teacher victimization. The authors emphasize the small class size is not as important to lowering violence as is having a teacher keep the same students over an extended period. That is, rotating students every 50 minutes leads to depersonalization and thus violence. As for resources, enlarging the extent to which teachers are provided with the material and equipment they need is also important in decreasing disruption..

Authority issues, according to the authors, are also important in lowering disruption. When a school is run in a clear, explicit and firm manner, both teacher and student victimization are decreased. Cooperation between teachers and administrators leads to lowered teacher victimization. When teachers show confusion about school policies or respond ambiguously to student misconduct (as by lowering grades or ignoring misconduct altogether), both teacher and student victimization are relatively high. Although the authors stress the importance of clarity and consensus about school rules and policies, they find little evidence that giving students a part in generating these rules is necessary for lowering school violence.

For their analysis of school crime and disruption, Ianni and Reuss-Ianni (1979) draw together the evidence from the National Institute of Education's Violent School--Safe School study (Asner and Broschart 1978) as well as other, smaller-scale research. They note several community characteristics as generally related to school crime and disruption: city size (school crime decreases proportionately with city size); nonstudents loitering in the school (the number of loiterers is a predictor of increased dollar flow from vandalism and property damage); the absence of mothers or stepmothers at home; the unemployment of fathers (but not mothers); and family intactness in the community as well as disciplinary measures in the homes.

On the side of those characteristics that schools can control, Ianni and Reuss-Ianni argue that larger and more crowded schools have higher incidences of crime and disruption, as well as more serious problems with both.

Like Gottfredson and Daiger, they also stress the importance of responsibility and governance issues. Instead of teacher or student victimization, the authors base their findings on the amount of property damage in a school. But they come up with quite similar factors related to decreased violence: students' perceptions of the school as maintaining order and teachers' perceptions of their ability to maintain order in the class; and good coordination and mutual support between administration and faculty. In addition, Ianni and Reuss-Ianni identify several student attitudes and behaviors associated with decreased violence: lowered competition among students; students' expressed willingness to identify with teachers; students' perceptions that they have access to teachers; and

students' sense that ethnic and racial harmony is high.

According to Ianni and Reuss-Ianni, a number of authority variables were reported to be responsible for the improvement in those "turnaround" schools that had reversed a pattern of violence and disorder. These included items having to do with the principal, the teachers, and the students. Items concerning the principal included the person's individual leadership style and educational leadership style; his or her visibility and availability to students and staff; his or her ability to initiate a structure of order that is fair, firm and consistent; and his or her responsiveness to teacher and student input in terms of school policies.

Items concerning the teachers included their relationship with the administration and with students; their self-esteem, job satisfaction, and general agreement with the principal's educational and procedural styles; and their cohesiveness among themselves and sense of identification with students. Items concerning the students included a strong sense of school spirit and carefully and openly developed rules that are clearly announced, firmly enforced, and equally applicable to everyone.

Fifteen Thousand Hours

Any analysis of school characteristics as they relate to student disruption must include the insights of the careful study, Fifteen Thousand Hours, by Rutter, et al. (1979). This investigation involved not only two extensive surveys four years apart (1970 and 1974) of student records in twelve ethnically and socially mixed London schools, but also intensive observations in four of the schools over a period of two years as well as interviews with teachers and questionnaires from students in all twelve schools. After controlling for differences in students' backgrounds, the

authors were able to ascertain that secondary schools in London vary greatly with respect to delinquency, misbehavior, attendance, and examination success, and that these variations remain relatively stable over time. According to the authors, "although the home area of the pupils might have played some small part in influencing their behavior and attainments, the effects did not in any way account for school differences in pupil outcomes" (p.153). More important, through their research it became evident that delinquency, misbehavior, attendance and examination success are related to a complex of school characteristics.

To summarize their findings, Rutter et al. discovered that any one school performs fairly similarly on all the measures of school outcomes. That is, schools that have better student behavior also have better examination success and less delinquency. In contrast to the findings of Gottfredson and Daiger and Ianni and Reuss-Ianni, differences between schools are not due to such physical qualities as the size or age of the school or the space available. Nor do broad differences in administration or organization appear to have necessary consequences. Rutter et al. point to a number of factors related to behavior and achievement that are open to modification by the staff. These include:

- a strong academic emphasis and teacher's expectations for students' academic success
- consistent values and standards, with a stress on positive rewards
- good material and emotional conditions for pupils, including the staff's positive attitudes towards them.

Rutter et al. stress the importance of strong lesson plans which allow little waste of time and indicate high performance standards. Homework should also be regularly assigned and marked. They also emphasize the

importance of teachers' expectations for students' academic success.

"It appears that both general attitudes and specific actions to emphasize academic expectations can play a part here. Children are liable to work better if taught in an atmosphere of confidence that they can and will succeed in the tasks they are set" (p. 188).

As with the other studies of student disruption, schools are better in all student outcomes when there are values and standards for both academic performance and discipline that are consistent and generally agreed upon by administrators, teachers, and students alike. The results of the Rutter study demonstrate the importance of immediate, positive reinforcement. At the same time, punishment (particularly corporal punishment) seems to be associated with more delinquency and poor attendance.

Good conditions for pupils include such concrete items as a clean, tidy, and well painted school with attractive pictures and plants and furniture in a good state of repair. Also, providing access to a telephone, making refreshments available, and allowing students in the building during breaks contributes to a generally comfortable environment associated with better student behavior and academic success.

In a nonmaterial vein, good conditions for students include the staff's positive responses to them and their work. Shared activities between teachers and students, such as out-of-school outings, also create common goals and thus help to decrease conflict. In addition, delinquency is lower in those schools where students remain together in the same form or set throughout schooling. This last factor is particularly interesting because it provides a mode of preserving group cohesion in large schools and so may help to explain why Rutter et al. found school size per se unimportant.

In any case, all of these variables clearly describe means of decreasing alienation.

Finally, in contrast to the findings of Gottfredson and Daiger, Rutter et al. report that schools in which a high proportion of students are given positions of responsibility have better outcomes in both pupil behavior and examination success. Such positions include form captain (American equivalent: class president) as well as active roles in assemblies and other school meetings. Rutter et al. hypothesize that giving responsibility to students creates better academic and social behavior because it conveys trust and sets standards of maturity. It also may help generate more positive attitudes toward schooling in general through the mechanism of identification. Again, the discrepancy between the findings of the two studies may have to do with those activities considered as giving student's responsibility or a voice. Clearly, in some schools student governance is largely window dressing, and it would not be surprising, therefore, that it had no effect in those instances. Unfortunately, it is not clear from the Gottfredson and Daiger study exactly what forms of student participation were identified and then discounted as effective in lowering disruption.

Because the combined effect of these and other variables was much greater than any individual factor on its own, Rutter et al. posit a school ethos. "The implication is that the individual actions or measures may combine to create a particular ethos, or set of values, attitudes and behaviors which will become characteristic of the school as a whole" (p.179).

Commonalities and Differences in Findings

To summarize the findings thus far, while Gottfredson and Daiger and

Ianni and Reuss-Ianni place a good deal of emphasis on school size and student numbers in creating an alienating or disruptive atmosphere, or, conversely, in decreasing anomie and disruption, for Rutter et al., these are not important variables. Instead, for these authors specific organizational strategies like keeping students together as they proceed through school may work to create the cohesion that small size implies for the other authors. All three studies, however, concur that clear and consistent rules and high expectations for students' academic success are critical to lowering misbehavior and disruption. While the Gottfredson and Daiger and Ianni and Reuss-Ianni studies stress the importance of principal leadership and teacher authority, Rutter et al. also focus on student responsibility. This difference may be due partly to what the authors chose to look at or how they defined their terms. As will become evident throughout this paper, responsibility and leadership are issues pointed to by all studies, but the placement of that responsibility and leadership appears to differ according to the kinds of schools being studied (and presumably the real opportunities for responsibility and leadership in each) as well as the predispositions of the authors.

V. DESEGREGATED COMPREHENSIVE HIGH SCHOOLS

The preceding studies of comprehensive high schools, while at times noting a mixed racial composition, have not isolated the effects of racial composition or desegregation. Yet many of the findings of the general high school literature have implications for the relationship between desegregation and student attitudes and behavior--and a number of the recommendations for decreasing violence and other manifestations of

alienation are repeated by the desegregation studies.

Alienation and Racial Mixing

The general comprehensive high school literature focuses on institutionalized ways in which schools can and do alienate all students, and how this might be changed. By comparison, the literature on desegregated secondary schools describes the differential impact of similar school characteristics (administrative leadership, tracking, systems of rules, teacher expectations) on minority and white students. By viewing students specifically as white, black or Hispanic, this research also begins to tease out a new dimension of alienation: that is, the distance and conflict or communication and harmony between students supported or alleviated by the formal and informal decisions of administrators and teachers. The desegregation literature also points specifically to the ways that a multi-racial or multiethnic school can be divided and made alienating by different and even opposing values.

The relationship between school desegregation and student alienation is not simple. If alienation is heightened when cultural values are no longer shared, when there are feelings of estrangement or loss of control, then desegregation can surely have a mixed effect on both minority and white students. On the other hand, most Americans share the ideal of cultural pluralism and its promise of widening the horizon of possibilities for all peoples. For those committed to desegregation, the question is not whether students of different racial and ethnic backgrounds should go to school together, but under what conditions desegregation is most likely to occur in a harmonious and beneficial manner.

First is the issue of when in a student's life desegregation takes

place. Research has shown the importance of desegregating in the first grade or earlier, before children's minds have been set about the supposed racial inferiority or superiority of their group (Henderson and von Euler 1981). In fact, studies showing negative or insignificant results in the achievement of black students after desegregation are largely of students who have been desegregated in their high school years (Hawley 1979). Despite studies showing the benefits of early desegregation on student achievement, there is unfortunately no systematic research on the connection between the timing of desegregation to school violence or interracial hostilities in desegregated schools. It would seem logical that late desegregation (in the high school years) would increase the likelihood of school violence.

Next is the question of what is actually meant when one speaks of a desegregated school. All legal mandates may be met, but a school can be as segregated as it was originally (Beckum 1979). Only scattered studies of the effects of school desegregation on student behavior offer details of the concrete conditions. Yet "desegregation" can clearly mean a variety of situations, from a smoothly functioning school led by a principal and staff dedicated to full integration, to a school marked by staff ambivalence, divided by bitterness and strife, and resegregated by a variety of bureaucratic mechanisms. In a major review of the desegregation literature, Rossell et al. (1981) found, for example, the following commonly used means of resegregating students: standardized tests resorting students along racial and class lines; tracking that maintains racial separation; special education classes funneling off minority students; and disciplinary procedures unequally enforced and resulting in a large number of suspensions and dropouts among black students. All these resegregation devices in

desegregated schools are clearly alienating, if not incendiary, to black students and divisive in relations between black and white students (though no research to date focuses on their effects). The willingness of schools to integrate sports and other extracurricular activities is part of creating a truly desegregated environment. It is therefore ironic that Gordon (1976) found that busing logistics prevented after-school interracial contacts between students in the several communities he studied.

Desegregation and Student Disruption

Two studies summarize the effects of desegregation on student disruption--with quite different conclusions. Gottfredson and Daiger (1979) discuss desegregation in the context of a general analysis of school violence. Without detailing any of the internal conditions of the "desegregated" schools, they come to the conclusion that desegregated junior high schools, but not desegregated high schools, are associated with slightly higher rates of student victimization. Among desegregated junior high schools, those where many students are bused, which are under court order to desegregate, which have a local desegregation plan, or which are racially imbalanced have even higher rates of victimization. According to these data, the major variable appears to be the percentage of a school's students who are bused to achieve racial balance.

On the other side, as part of a wide ranging examination of the desegregation research, Weinberg (1977) reviews 46 studies of disorder and disruption in, for the most part, recently desegregated schools, which detail the exact administrative and social contexts of the violence or, on the contrary, positive interracial adaptation. On the basis of these

studies, Weinberg concludes: "It may be stated with high confidence that interracial interaction usually leads to the development of positive racial attitudes" (p.211). Moreover, Weinberg argues that studies of student disorders in interracial schools point to institutional resistance to educational change as the single most abrasive factor in generating disorders. Although some commentators, black and white, have cautioned that black children's self-concepts are too fragile for the strains of desegregation, Weinberg argues that when schools are unable to act positively in promoting desegregation, black students, particularly in large cities, organize themselves on their own behalf. "Black students in interracial and desegregated schools are shown to be far more resilient and capable of autonomous action than is widely supposed" (Weinberg 1977, p.212).

Desegregation and Stress

However great their resilience--and student protest often results in more stress on students--most studies suggest that under existing conditions of desegregation black students are likely to find their school days particularly hard in desegregated secondary schools. Absenteeism, suspension, and dropout rates all attest to this. Weinberg (1977) describes research showing high absenteeism (particularly among bused students) and higher rates of suspension for blacks after desegregation is instituted. Rossell et al. (1981, p.304) describe research indicating that black students are more likely to be suspended or otherwise punished for minor offenses than are white students and assert that "the large disparities in suspension rates among [desegregated] schools, even within districts, argue against blaming students." The authors also summarize

two reports on the complicated relationship between dropping out and desegregation. The first, a national study by Aspira of America (1979) indicates that Hispanic dropout rate is highest in segregated districts, and that less segregated schools produce more Hispanic graduates. This pattern holds for blacks as well, except in the South, where a higher black graduation rate exists in highly segregated districts. In other words, except where desegregation is highly stressful, it promotes graduation. The second study, a four-year analysis of a Southwestern community by Felice and Richardson (1977) points to busing as a factor in increasing the dropout rates of black and Mexican-American students, but describes the dropout rate as also influenced by teacher expectations, which in turn are largely related to the socioeconomic character of the school.

A detailed participant-observation study by Cusick (1973) of the formal and informal relationships between black and white students in a racially-mixed, urban secondary school suggests some of the institutional factors which can turn desegregation into an alienating experience for students and teachers alike. Cusick argues that biracialism is potentially divisive in that it prevents the "consensual basis" that might otherwise be used to solve conflicts. Although organizational energy might have been directed positively "to creating a 'multiplicity of associations and coalitions' among students which would have, hopefully, forced the blacks and whites to criss-cross and thus break up their one 'major line of cleavage'" (p.167), instead the school operated negatively, adopting a number of largely restrictive and alienating policies to prevent potential conflict from developing into open hostility.

The school administrators spent their time in the halls to "make their presence felt," as the principal put it; the students were allowed no power; the periods were 57 minutes long with only a few minutes for passing; there were no free periods, no study halls; the cafeteria service was brief one year, eliminated the next, and the administrators admitted they eliminated it for security reasons; school functions such as dances and parties were rare; funds had to be allocated for security guards.... I believe that the technique of non-teaching used by some teachers was a way of keeping potential conflict in balance. The teachers, by walking around and interacting with various individuals and small groups, kept the students--many of whom were bored--from joining together or interacting in any way which might have produced conflict either among the factions or between the teacher and the united students (p.164).

As Cusick notes, the preventative approach creates a vicious cycle, reinforcing the potential for conflict that is ostensibly being avoided. Students don't have a chance to come together for the first step in solving their problems. "The students seldom had time to do other than go to class and take care of themselves; therefore, they did little to alleviate the potential conflict and, in fact, reinforced the biracialness that kept them apart" (p.169).

In a cautious and thorough review of the research on psychological ramifications of desegregation among primary school students, St. John (1975) argues that positive administrative leadership is the most important precondition for reducing prejudice among black and white students. Following Allport (1954), she hypothesizes that black and white students should develop favorable attitudes toward each other, provided that the contact is prolonged and that "(1) they are fairly similar in social class and academic background and in the status they are accorded in the desegregated school, (2) there is no real clash of interests or tense intergroup competition, and

(3) the school administration shows no racial bias and favors full integration rather than mere desegregation" (pp.97-98). She observes, however, that most desegregation studies measure changes in attitudes over the first six months, that is, much too soon; that the backgrounds of black and white students are rarely similar economically, socially, or academically; and that administrative leadership is obviously not always behind desegregation.

St. John's emphasis on homogeneous groupings is both interesting and puzzling. First, it would appear to argue against the very reason most often given for desegregation--its effect in improving the achievement of black students; studies of desegregation and achievement commonly attribute increased achievement of black students to being with students of a higher social class. If desegregation is only useful for creating cross-race friendships when social class remains the same, then its benefits for achievement would seem to be nullified. Yet social ease is clearly related to achievement. Moreover, as we shall see, other studies of both public and private schools indicate that homogeneity may not be the issue.

St. John's survey also points to an interesting configuration of attitudes on the part of black students as a result of changing to a desegregated school. This configuration includes heightened anxiety in reaction to real or perceived social threats; identity conflict caused by the confrontation with real or perceived differences in values; and lowered self-esteem provoked by feelings of inferiority as well as the real burden of proving oneself to a white, often more prepared and suspicious majority.

Decreasing Alienation in Desegregated Schools

What can desegregated schools do to decrease student alienation? Certain answers emerge from the preceding discussion: desegregating students in the early years long before high school and before wide differences in achievement and ability make it possible to resegregate them through tracking and other means, or before racial hostilities have been formed; asserting strong, positive leadership to bring about integration; eliminating institutionalized, racially-biased or racially-fearful ways of dealing with students and creating race-fair, positive ways in their stead; planning busing so that it allows for full participation in school activities, or working toward integrated housing; and creating coalitions and associations to generate student cooperation across race lines.

In fact, several reviews of the desegregation literature arrive at these and other suggestions. As Hawley (1979, p.32) puts the matter, "It is not enough to put children of different races in the same school and go about business as usual." Instead, he argues, administrative and teacher behaviors, and classroom practices are key to making desegregation work. Based on a wide-ranging review of the research, Henderson and von Euler (1981) offer the following suggestions for changes that must take place within the school. All seek to eliminate racially-biased practices and to promote racial fairness.

- Tracking and ability groupings, which result in de facto segregation within the school, should be eliminated. Desegregated schools with segregated classrooms are seedbeds for conflict and for the perpetuation of stigma.
- Curriculum and activities must reflect the minority as well as the majority subcultures. This commitment to a multicultural approach must go beyond celebrating the birthday of a black hero, and it must include a reevaluation and perhaps reformulation of school symbols, colors, and mascots.

• Procedures of conduct, evaluation, and discipline must be perceived as fair by all racial groups.

• Participation in extracurricular activities, from sports to field trips, must be made equally available to all groups. Special consideration must be given to bused students.

Henderson and von Euler also stress contributions that must be made by administrators, faculty and other staff:

• A strong principal with good leadership characteristics is critical. This person sets the tone for the school and makes clear to teachers and students what is expected of them.

• Counselors, through their expertise and their networks, are crucial to the long-range gains of desegregation, including access to higher education, higher status occupations, and higher income.

• Teachers must be able to teach heterogeneous groups, including students who have been subjected to an inferior education. They must be capable of self-analysis so that they can identify stereotyping and other kinds of discriminatory behavior in themselves and others. They must have substantive knowledge of different groups' histories, attitudes, behavior, and learning styles, and they must know techniques for avoiding crises and relieving daily tensions.

• Nonteaching staff at all levels can create a positive climate of race relations in the school as well as prevent and cope with conflict. It is important to desegregate staff at all levels.

• Effective in-service training must be provided for teachers, administrators, school boards, and all supporting staff to ensure the above characteristics and capabilities.

Most recently, Rossell et al. (1981) identify approximately the same range of strategies. In general, they assert the importance of eliminating racially-biased practices and of creating strong, positive leadership at all levels. But they also take a more tentative position on tracking and on multiethnic texts and other quick solutions to creating cultural fairness. On the one hand, they note that if tracking can create homogeneous groupings of black and white students, these students may be more likely to respond favorably to one another. On the

other hand, they also refer to a study (Schofield and Sagar 1977) showing that desegregation can create more positive intergroup relations even when differences in achievement levels and socioeconomic backgrounds are large. This is in contrast to St. John's findings. Like St. John, however, Rosell et al. stress the importance of working directly to create cooperation among students. They suggest fostering cooperation in small, task-oriented learning groups.

Commonalities and Differences in Findings, and Unanswered Questions

It is unfortunate that the desegregation literature does not even mention some of the variables that seem salient, even if debated, in the comprehensive school research. Does school size make a difference in promoting effective desegregation and decreasing racial hostilities between students? Do administrative policies like shifting students from one teacher to another, so that a single teacher sees a large number of students each day and is not intimate with any, have an effect? Strangely, the desegregation literature is largely silent on issues of size and number.

Issues of administrative leadership emerge in the desegregation research as they did in the studies of comprehensive schools. Just as it is important that principals and teachers have a positive attitude and high expectations for student achievement if misbehavior and delinquency are to be prevented; so too the dedication of school staff to desegregation is essential to the effectiveness of that process. But what role does student leadership play? The desegregation literature is silent on this issue.

The desegregation research adds a new dimension, however, in emphasizing

the overt and covert forms of racial bias that must be eliminated if black and Hispanic students are to feel at home and if hostilities are to be eliminated between them and white students. The issue of racial bias or racial fairness is not dealt with by the general comprehensive school studies which attempt to elicit the causes of violence.

The desegregation literature also brings up, but does not solve, issues related to homogeneity. Do students need to be of similar socioeconomic backgrounds to feel at home with themselves and each other? Are those administrative mechanisms which promote homogeneity within a subgroup (say, tracking) useful or divisive for the whole? Much of the literature that argues for homogeneity is now at least ten years old. Recently, there has been a general move within education toward promoting heterogeneous groupings. The mainstreaming of handicapped students is one example in this direction; a number of studies emphasizing the negative effects of tracking is another. The stigma of tracking and special classes is emphasized, as is the isolation and lack of preparedness for coping in a "normal," mainstream environment. The few studies on mainstreamed students (Adkisson 1981; Yoshida, MacMillan, and Meyers 1976) indicate that there are almost immediate positive results. Clearly fashions in education change, as everywhere else, and the literature can always be mustered in support of these alterations.

On the other hand, studies of desegregation indicate that cooperation among students of different racial backgrounds can and must be consciously fostered. Placing these students side by side in a classroom is not enough. The question is, if school staff work toward creating student cooperation, by allowing for in and out of classroom association, do

background skill differences between students make a difference in the success of the project? And even if it is harder to achieve feelings of ease and cooperation among very heterogeneous students, is it not still a worthwhile effort?

VI. ALTERNATIVE SCHOOLS

An alternative school has been defined as "any school that provides alternative learning experiences to those provided by conventional schools within its community and that is available by choice to every family within its community at no extra cost" (Smith 1974). The alternative school movement began to bloom in the late 1960s, at a time when popular ideals emphasized egalitarianism and participatory decision making, and when there was a great push to increase the participation of minorities in all phases of public life.

As alternative schools have grown across the country, they have fallen into a number of broad types, including: open schools, continuation schools, minischools, schools without walls, learning centers, multicultural schools, free schools, schools within schools, magnet schools, and community schools. They have experimented with such varying learning models as Summerhill education, open education, individualized instruction, fundamental "back-to-basics" education, career vocational education, experiential learning, and behavior modification (Carnegie Council 1979; Barr 1981). Despite their great variety, and despite the differences in degree to which any one school may have a single attribute, as Krahf (1977) has noted, these alternative schools share a number of qualities:

voluntarism

participatory decision making

- small size
- organizational flexibility
- egalitarianism
- individualized learning
- humaneness
- school-community commitment
- more comprehensive goals than conventional schools.

More than any other school movement, alternative education has spoken to the issue of alienation. Most alternative schools have been created in the context of large schools in large and medium sized cities, where depersonalization and rigidity have alienated some staff members and a significant segment of the student population (Liebrader 1977). By 1981, 80 percent of the nation's larger school districts (those enrolling 25,000 or more students) had alternative schools, while one out of every five districts enrolling less than 600 students also had one or more such schools (Raywid 1981).

Alternative schools began as havens for students disaffected with traditional public schooling. Although alternative schools attract academically competent, white, middle-class students, increasingly they have also been directed specifically toward those who have attendance or discipline problems, who are potential or actual dropouts, or who have severe difficulty in mastering the basic skills. One study of 19 alternative schools found that, of seven for which racial data were available, six were at least 40 percent black, and a third of the total schools were established for actual or potential dropouts (Duke and Muzio 1978). While an alternative school must by definition be voluntary, the common purpose of assisting disaffected youth as well as the use of referrals as a means of admission means that the actual degree of student choice in attending varies from almost total to barely any.

The problem with discussing alternative schools is that the movement has not produced a body of systematic research. According to Raywid (1982, p.2), "Much of the extant knowledge about alternatives comes from evaluations. And to date there have been no national appraisals. Since there is a great deal of variation in alternative programs--as well as in the nature and quality of the attempts to evaluate them--this means that the knowledge base for alternative education is narrow and shaky." Moreover, as Raywid notes, "Virtually all of the evaluations have been of single programs. They have been done under very different auspices, and for very different purposes and audiences." In fact, appropriate methods by which to evaluate nontraditional schooling in general are still relatively crude.

Despite these problems with the research, a half dozen documents now attempt to examine systematically a broad range of evaluations (Barr, Colston, and Parret 1977; Duke and Muzio 1978; Doob 1977; Arnove and Strout 1978; Newmann 1981; and Office of Juvenile Justice 1980). Though enthusiasm for alternative education differs, typically alternative schools are seen as leading to greater academic achievement, more positive attitudes toward schools, as well as greater involvement in school activities, and heightened self confidence, security, sense of control, responsibility and independence (Raywid 1982). Attitudinal changes are also reflected in a lessening of disruptive behavior. Vandalism is reported as markedly lower in alternative schools (Office of Juvenile Justice 1980; Smith, Barr, and Burke 1976), and drug use, gang conflicts, and racial clashes are reduced (Duke and Muzio 1978).

Not surprisingly, the literature on alternative education offers many

of the same suggestions for decreasing alienation as does the comprehensive high school research. This is partly because much of the comprehensive high school literature uses hints from the alternative schools movement about what works. But it is also because historically the alternative schools movement evolved to deal with disaffected and disruptive students.

Three Studies

Based on an analytical overview of the research, three studies attempt to isolate the specific characteristics of alternative schools that affect students' attitudes and behaviors.

In Delinquency Prevention Through Alternative Education, the Office of Juvenile Justice (1980) focuses on the relationship between disruptive behavior and poor academic achievement and offers alternative education as a strategy to decrease delinquency and thus increase the chances for achievement. The document differentiates those characteristics that "lead to success" in decreasing disruption and increasing academic achievement from those which "may lead to success" in these areas. The first, more certain success area includes several items reminiscent of the comprehensive school literature: a strong, supportive administration; caring, competent teachers capable of developing cognitive skills; a goal-oriented and learning emphasis in the classroom; and clear learning goals. In addition, items are isolated that are more specific to the alternative context: individualized instruction with curricula tailored to students' learning needs and interests; clear rewards for individual improvement in academic competency; small student population in the program; and low student-adult ratio in the classroom.

For the Office of Juvenile Justice, school characteristics that "may lead to success" include involving students in decision making, involving parents, and supplying supplemental services such as counseling and support groups. The study also suggests that vocationally-oriented education programs may enhance student attachment to the school, if care is taken that learning takes place on the job and that the skills being developed will lead to future careers. Tracking in vocational or other areas, including in alternative education programs, is warned against, though the authors suggest that segregation in alternative education may not be detrimental if students have clearly volunteered for the program.

The research of Arnone and Strout (1978) is based on the assumption that the large bureaucratic learning environment is a principal cause of disruptive behavior. The authors also ground their work in a theoretical perspective that explains disruptive behavior as an ego defense, a means of protecting an individual from a derogated self-image caused by failure in important social roles. Like the Office of Juvenile Justice, the authors review the literature on alternative education as it relates to solving problems of student disruption. However, because of their theoretical perspective, they divide their findings into several related conditions that bolster and nourish the individual ego: those conducive to interpersonal relations; those conducive to academic success; and those conducive to a sense of power, to positive images of the future, and to an enhanced self-concept.

For Arnone and Strout, the conditions conducive to warm interpersonal relations include: a small total size (the median size of alternative schools is less than 200); a low student/staff ratio of, for example, 15-1;

competent, committed, and caring teachers; and trust between teachers and students. Conditions conducive to academic success, in their view, include experiences structured for success, individualized instruction (which also facilitates warm relations between teachers and students), a match between learners and the environment, and supportive services. Finally, conditions conducive to a sense of power, to positive images of the future, and to an enhanced self-concept include student choice of the educational setting itself, student involvement in decisionmaking, incorporation of work as part of the school program, and attention directed specifically to the affective area.

Newmann (1981) directs his analysis of alternative education specifically to eliciting the preponderance of those features that reduce student alienation. According to Newmann, organizational theory and the literature on the social psychology of organizations suggest six general approaches to reducing student alienation: voluntary choice; clear and consistent goals; small size; maximal opportunities for participation in school policy and management; extended roles that include cooperative endeavors and contributions to the school's operation; and student work that allows for "continuous development of products, flexible individual pacing, and support of both primal and modern work" (p.555). In an interesting experiment, Newmann then rates 13 specific reforms generated through the alternative school movement according to the extent to which they may reduce student alienation. (See Table 1).

As Newmann notes, none of the reforms contradict any of the guidelines, and each seems likely to promote at least one guideline. On the other hand, no single reform promotes more than three guidelines,

*Table 1

RATINGS OF EXTENT TO WHICH REFORMS IMPLEMENT GUIDELINES FOR REDUCING ALIENATION

REFORMS:	GUIDELINES						TOTALS		
	voluntary choice	clear, consistent educational goals	small size	participation	extended and cooperative roles	Integrated work			
	+	?	/	+	?	/	+	?	/
Schools Within Schools	?	?	+	?	?	?	1	5	0
Specialized Schools	+	+	?	?	?	?	2	4	0
Alternative Schools	+	?	+	+	?	?	3	3	0
House System	?	?	+	?	?	/	1	4	1
Personalized Advising	?	+	/	?	?	/	1	3	2
Flexible Scheduling	+	/	/	/	?	?	1	2	3
Individualized Programming	?	+	/	+	?	?	2	3	1
Pro-Social Conduct	/	+	/	?	+	/	2	1	3
Participation In Governance	+	?	/	+	?	/	2	2	2
The Basics	?	+	/	/	?	?	1	3	2
Career-Vocational Education	+	+	/	/	?	?	2	2	2
Challenge Education	+	?	/	/	?	+	2	2	2
Community Based Learning	+	?	/	/	?	+	2	2	2
Total	+	7	6	3	3	1	22		
	?	5	6	1	5	12	36		
	/	1	1	9	5	0	4		20

KEY:

- +
- Reform likely to result in practice that promotes the guideline.
- Reform likely to result in practice that contradicts the guideline.
- ?
- Reform could be implemented in ways that promote or contradict guideline.
- / Reform largely irrelevant to the guideline, no basis for assessing potential promotion or contradiction.

*Fred Neumann, "Reducing Student Alienation in High Schools," 51, 4, p. 558.
 Copyright (c) by Harvard Educational Review 1981.

and almost half the cells are filled with questions.

Of the thirteen reform efforts, about half positively address student choice and goal clarity, but no more than a few necessarily address the other four guidelines. This inventory shows that most of the salient reform efforts in secondary education are two-edged swords, capable either of reducing or exacerbating student alienation in school, if they affect it at all (p.557).

Limitations and Promises of Alternative Education

That alternative education is no panacea is made clear by even its most partisan supporters. Recurring criticisms emerge in most of the literature on alternative schools. Most important is the issue of student selection criteria and procedures. Both the Office of Juvenile Justice (1980) and Arnove and Strout (1978) warn against the courts and probation officers using alternative schooling as a legal option, or the schools using it as an alternative to suspension. While an alternative program may be geared toward students with histories of disaffection and disruption, coercion acts as a negative impact on the whole program. Equally important, narrowly defined, coercive programs easily create de facto segregation. Having reviewed alternative schools in ten major cities in some depth, Arnove and Strout report that "there are strong indications that the twin phenomena of 'creaming' and 'dumping' are occurring through the uses of alternatives...what alternatives constitute, in effect, are a new form of tracking" (p.20). Tracked programs, as both the Office of Juvenile Justice and Arnove and Strout make clear, tend to isolate minority students. Moreover, Arnove and Strout find that those programs with high percentages of minority students also tend to control students through operant conditioning and other forms of control rarely used with white,

middle-class populations.

Clearly alternative schools offer hopeful guidelines for making schools less alienating. Small size, clear goals, more personal and cooperative relationships, greater participation in decision making--all these are strategies put into practice in most alternative environments. However, there is a danger that alternative schools may become yet another means of resegregating students and of siphoning off troublesome individuals. To the extent that this happens, it will generate the same stigmas and other negative side effects of tracking and special classes while allowing the mainstream comprehensive high school to go on without change.

VII. PRIVATE SCHOOLS

Approximately 10 percent of all secondary school students are enrolled in private schools (Coleman et al. 1980), with 6 percent in the Catholic schools (Greeley 1982). Black and other minority families appear to be increasingly choosing private schools as alternatives for their sons and daughters. Most minority students receiving a private education are in Catholic schools. As a national average, 15 percent of all sophomores and 15 percent of all seniors in Catholic schools are either black or Hispanic--approximately 6 percent black and 8 to 9 percent Hispanic.

Recently, private schooling has become the focus of public controversy because of two areas of proposed legislation. One would eliminate or decrease standards for desegregation in private schools seeking federal assistance. The other would help support private schools through tuition credits and school vouchers to students' families.

Two recent studies, said to demonstrate the benefits of private

over public schools, particularly for minority students, have added fire to the arguments about public versus private schooling. Though their conclusions can be, and one has been, criticized, they bring up interesting issues about the goals of education, offer suggestions for the organization and ethos of effective schools that may contribute to our general knowledge of schooling, and offer hints for improving public as well as private education.

Public and Private Schools

Briefly, the argument of Public and Private Schools (Coleman, Hoffer, and Kilgore 1980) is that private schools produce better cognitive outcomes than do public schools, that they offer a greater chance for an integrated education than do public schools, and that tuition tax credits and educational vouchers for private schools might be useful policy alternatives for bringing more Hispanic and black students into the private schools.

However, as a number of scholars have pointed out, the study suffers from numerous methodological problems ("Controversies" 1982; "Evidence" 1981; and Page and Keith 1981). Because the survey materials behind Public and Private Schools were drawn from the first wave of the large 1980 National Opinion Research Center (NORC) study, High School and Beyond, the sampling was not geared to compare private and public schools, and some of the categories, particularly of minorities in private schools, are extremely small (Bryk in "Evidence" 1981). Although the authors control for students' socioeconomic backgrounds, there is no way for them to eliminate the self-selecting factor of choosing a private versus a public school (Murname, Braddock in "Evidence" 1981). Moreover, some of

the comparisons between achievement of public and private school students are faulty. For example, academic achievement in all public and private schools is contrasted, despite the fact that only 34 percent of those in public schools are in academic programs in comparison to 70 percent of those in private schools. When students in academic programs only are compared, no differences in achievement between private and public schools emerge (Bryk, Braddock in "Evidence" 1981; Crain and Hawley in "Controversies" 1982). Coleman and his associates have also been criticized for jumping from observed relationships between existing variables to answers to questions like "What will happen if?" The authors' detailed and sophisticated statistical analysis cannot predict what the effect of tuition exemption or vouchers would be on minority enrollment in private education (Heyns in "Evidence" 1981). Their view that federal intervention to create these changes would substantially increase minority enrollment in private schools without changing the characteristics of these schools is hard to imagine.

On the other hand, several critics are quick to praise the Coleman study for what it says about the relationship of school ethos and organization to school effectiveness, whether these schools are public or private (Ravitch in "Controversies" 1982; Bryk in "Evidence" 1981). Ravitch notes such "effective schooling" practices elicited by the study as an orderly climate, disciplinary practices considered effective by students, teachers and administrators, high enrollment in academic courses, regular homework, and lower incidence of student absenteeism, class-cutting, and other misbehavior.

Granting the controversies and criticisms Public and Private Schools

has provoked, the report can still be used to shed further light on several issues particularly relevant to decreasing the alienation of minority students.

Nonalienating Schooling as Seen from Private Schools

Two conditions which private schools do not necessarily provide offer an interesting critique of public schooling. The first is a wide range in curriculum. By contrast with public secondary schools, most private schools and especially Catholic schools offer a narrow range of subjects, largely limited to the traditional academic disciplines. Although the wide diversity of curriculum in public schools is ostensibly geared to the variety of needs of its student body, it may instead reflect the specialization and fragmentation that is so prevalent in the society at large and have little to do with meaningful choices in response to students' needs.

The second condition, according to popular opinion, is small size and smaller classes. While both Catholic and "other private schools" do have smaller total size than public schools, and the other private schools have a sharply lowered student-teacher ratio, Catholic schools actually have slightly fewer teachers per students than the public schools. Thus small classes themselves may not be the alienating factor, but rather something like class rotation which decreases personal contact while maintaining the same student-teacher ratio may be. Certainly, there is more to understand about the conditions under which size or numbers makes a difference.

Catholic schools, according to Coleman et al. (1980), enroll half as high a proportion of blacks, and other private schools a quarter as high a

proportion of blacks, as do public schools. From the minority student's perspective, attending a private school is much more likely to offer a "desegregated" than a (black) segregated environment. However, the problem, as Braddock ("Evidence" 1981) rightly points out, is, in fact, still one of (white) segregation and minority access. In any case, once in private schools, minority students certainly operate in a largely white environment. That this is a positive environment--as judged by the lack of violence and conflict, the higher aspirations and achievement--can be seen from other information on private schooling.

Coleman et al. (1980) offer a number of details concerning disciplinary practices in private and public schools. Virtually all Catholic schools have dress codes, compared with two-thirds of other private schools and half of the public schools. Students in Catholic schools are most likely to rate the effectiveness of discipline as "excellent" or "good," followed by those in other private schools, and only then by public school students. Students in both Catholic and secular private schools are also much more likely to see school discipline as fair than are public school students. This is so despite the fact that over the past fifteen years the federal and local courts have subjected public schools to numerous legal strictures to ensure fairness. As Coleman and his associates note, such data suggest that perceptions of fairness have less to do with legalistic interpretations of equal treatment than with more direct, personal responsibility for authority and control.

Related to schools' disciplinary climate are students' perceptions of teachers' interest in them. Here again, public school students see their teachers as the least interested (this is so even for a subcategory,

high-performance public schools). Teachers in the Catholic schools are more often seen as interested, and teachers in other private schools still more often. Catholic schools are perceived as stricter but less nurturing than are other private schools, while public schools are viewed by their students as neither strict, fair, nor nurturing.

The greater discipline of the private schools can be seen in the example of homework. Among the sophomores sampled, public school students average four hours of homework per week, Catholic and other private school students and high-performance public school students average five and one-half hours per week, and high performance private school students average nine hours per week. This is despite relatively little difference among all the categories of students in their expressed "liking for work hard." That is, particularly in an era where after-school jobs are sadly a rarity, public school students would probably do more homework, were it only demanded of them.

Students in Catholic schools have the best attendance records and the least instances of cutting, followed by those in other private schools, while students in public schools are most likely to be absent and to cut class. The incidence of fighting and disobedience, drug and alcohol use, and school vandalism is highest in public schools, followed by Catholic schools, and then by other private schools. Whatever the weaknesses of private, and particularly Catholic schools--and one might well criticize the latter's uniformity, rigidity, and inability to foster diversity--they are more likely than are public schools to have the characteristics of "effective schooling," as well as to be low on factors that point to alienation.

Finally, Coleman et al. (1980) asked a number of questions to elicit students' feelings about themselves. On items expressing fate control and self-esteem, public school students were lowest, Catholic school students higher, students in other private schools and high-performance public schools only slightly higher, and students in high-performance private schools somewhat higher than the rest. The authors hypothesize that the academic achievement afforded by the private schools and high-performance public schools is a within-school experience that gives students a sense of fate control and confidence in themselves. However, other variables might equally be cited. There is the unresolved question of differences in family background. The privilege of being able to attend a private school must also elevate students' sense of themselves. Finally, their belief in the effectiveness and fairness of discipline and their perception of teachers' interest may also contribute to their higher sense of fate control and self-esteem.

Catholic High Schools and Minority Students

A second, more recent study of private schooling, Catholic High Schools and Minority Students by Andrew M. Greeley (1982), is likely to generate criticisms and controversies similar to those evoked by Public and Private Schools. Like Coleman et al., Greeley uses data gathered by the 1980 NORC High School and Beyond Survey. Like Coleman et al., Greeley uses his data to argue for the effectiveness of private schools, particularly for minority students. In fact, Greeley sees Catholic schools as most effective among the "poor." However, his definition would more accurately describe the working class: those whose family income is under \$12,000, whose parents did not go to college but are upwardly mobile, and who them-

selves have been placed in a general, rather than an academic track. According to Greeley, after accounting for family and personal differences (like Coleman, Greeley ignores self-selection), black and Hispanic Catholic school students show higher levels of academic effort and achievement than black and Hispanic students in public schools. They are also less likely to report discipline problems, twice as likely to do five or more hours of homework a week, and much more likely to expect to graduate from college.

Like Coleman and his associates, Greeley shows that black and Hispanic students are more likely to have white schoolmates in a private than in a public school (white students are less likely to have minority schoolmates). Greeley also argues that low-income students are somewhat more likely to have high-income classmates in a Catholic than in a public school, though, of course, the reverse is true for high income students. The point is that, insofar as achievement for low-income minority students has been shown to be raised by contact with white, middle-class students, Catholic schools should provide exactly such an environment. That the heterogeneity of social classes added to racial integration does not necessarily harm minority students is shown by their positive attitudes and good achievement, as well as the low incidence of conflict and disruption as compared to public schools.

Discipline in Catholic schools, according to Greeley's data, is generally much stricter than in public schools--and so, presumably, allows for more teaching. Dress codes and smoking rules exist in most Catholic schools, though hall passes are less common than in public schools. Partly because of this strictness, discipline problems are less frequent:

absenteeism, cutting class, physical conflict among students, vandalism and drugs and alcohol are only minor problems, according to Catholic school principals, and rape, possession of weapons, and verbal abuse of teachers practically never occur. Clearly this makes possible more time and energy for teaching and learning. Greeley also points out that one cannot attribute the paucity of discipline problems to suspensions (which Coleman et al. considered a possibility) since his evidence indicates no difference between the suspension rates in Catholic and public schools.

More detailed than Public and Private Schools, Catholic Schools and Minority Students shows that black, Hispanic and white Catholic school students alike are twice as likely to consider discipline effective than their counterparts in public schools. To a lesser extent, black, Hispanic, and white students are all more likely to consider Catholic school discipline fair. Equally interesting, a school being run by a religious order, presumably because of the clear values this implies, is itself partially responsible for the effectiveness of the discipline. According to Greeley, "As far as minority students are concerned, much of the difference in discipline between public and Catholic schools comes from the effectiveness of the control of a religious order and from the students' own view of the disciplinary system as fair and effective" (p.28).

Minority and white students in Catholic schools are at least twice as likely to rate the quality of instruction and teacher interest as "excellent" than are students in public schools. Homework, laboratory work, field projects, essays, poems, and term papers all appear to be given more often, and students are more likely to be satisfied with the academic effort made by their high school. Minority students in Catholic schools report

their grade average as being higher than do those in public schools.

Moreover, Greeley's data suggest that religious order ownership and the disciplinary environment are far more important than the characteristics and attributes students bring to the school. According to Greeley:

About half of the influence of the religious order on academic performance is filtered through the fact that religious order schools have both higher quality instruction and more effective discipline.... The other half of the religious order effect operates independently of quality of instruction and discipline and has a direct effect on academic performance, a direct effect marginally larger than that of disciplinary environment (p.39).

A self-conscious ideology and explicit system of values appears from Greeley's study to be an important element in and of itself.

Values and Alienation

Greeley's insight about the importance of the religious order to school effectiveness elucidates a theme that emerges here and there less explicitly throughout the various high school literatures. Abramowitz (1979), in her study of Catholic schools, notes the uniformity of purpose and attributes it, on the one hand, to parents choosing schools whose values conform to their own, and on the other, to the parochial schools ensuring that they remain attractive to their constituency.

Clear and consistent goals, uniformity of purpose, and a consensus in values--these are elements that the literature on effective schooling also stresses. Clearly values, goals and purposes can be directed toward authoritarian as well as egalitarian values, toward a racist vision as well as one of equality. Moreover, it can be argued that there is good in allowing varying points of view with room for debate and change. Nevertheless, most public secondary schools suffer from a paralysis of values and

purpose of any kind. As Friedenberg (1963) has argued, instead of offering students a range of genuine choices in values and points of view, an education for "mass" society has evolved which aims at the lowest common denominator, suiting neither the rich nor the poor, the gifted nor the disabled, and doing the least possible for those in between. Swamped by bureaucracy and entangled in legalism, additional rules and laws and new areas of specialization are the usual solutions to difficulty. From the standpoint of what might be undone and created anew, the more personal, value-enriched approach of the private schools, especially the Catholic schools, offer interesting hints.

VIII. CONCLUSION

Importance of the Whole Picture

Several points made throughout this review of the literature bear repeating in summary form. First, it is important to see alienation as a large, encompassing category and to use it as a means of understanding the variety of otherwise isolated variables, such as student violence, dropout rates, or low achievement, that may all be signs pointing to the same underlying condition. As Rutter et al. (1979) assert, there is something in a successful school that is greater than the sum of its successful parts. They call this something "ethos." Attacking a single symptom without looking at the ~~gen-talt~~ is only continuing to proceed with fragmented and specialized solutions that do not shift the picture and are likely to lead to new and different symptoms of alienation. As with the description of the tense biracial school where bureaucratic mechanisms prevented students from making contact with one another and heightened the tension that had

prompted this mechanical solution, so any attempt at attacking a single issue with a narrow solution is only going to stop up one hole and create pressure at another point.

Most of the studies that have been brought together here did not take a molar view. The discrepancies and contradictions in the suggestions offered may in part stem from the partial vision of each. If one doesn't ask the question, one won't get an answer. Most of the research doesn't ask about student responsibility; only a few that do ask the question specify what they mean. Also, the opportunities for such responsibility differ widely in the four school contexts. Still, some suggestions have emerged repeatedly.

Organizational Role in Decreasing Alienation

Most of the literature is in agreement that the following organizational elements foster alienation, as indicated by student disruption, conflict, apathy, low achievement and dropping out:

- large size, crowding, and/or rotation of students every period
- tracking, special classes, and discriminatory testing and disciplinary procedures
- busing which keeps students from full participation in curricular and extracurricular activities, or which creates a second-class status
- administrative resistance to integration which may manifest in a variety of ways, both formal and informal.

On the other side, the literature indicates that the following organizational procedures decrease alienation:

- students being allowed to proceed through school together, to stay in the same class with each other for more than a period, or to have other mechanisms for developing cohesion
- regular and consistent homework and high marking standards (with grades not being used for discipline)

- shared activities between teachers and students
- associations for students that form coalitions and decrease competition
- clear rules and coherent values, consistently enforced.

Principals, Teachers, and Students

Information on improving schooling can also be divided according to those behaviors which can be expected of the principal, those which can be expected of the teacher, and those expected of students. Schools with indications of lowered alienation have principals who are strong personal and educational leaders; they believe in their teachers and their students, and their expectations are high. These same schools have teachers whose morale and self-esteem are good; who expect a lot from their students, and who trust both the administration and the students. They assign homework, grade work regularly, and do not waste time in class disciplining students. Finally, students in these schools are likely to be cohesive through class and extracurricular formations. Because they perceive themselves as fairly treated, a source of conflict is lowered between them. Organizations are available for them to bridge the gaps of race and class.

Values

Literature from the Catholic schools implies that a part of ethos may also be a system of values which is believed in and acted upon. Clearly, bureaucratic and legal mandates are no substitute for personal attention and clear and strong beliefs and values. Yet in our pluralistic society, it is particularly difficult for a public school principal or a teacher to act with confidence in this area. Out of fear of disagreement

and debate, educators resort to the lowest common denominator of values and legalese.

How the public schools use these and other guidelines for decreasing student alienation will depend on the choices and decisions of many individuals. If school staff become more clear, more human, more courageous, in expressing the values and goals they hold, their differences may well also become more obvious. Although large comprehensive high schools face enormous obstacles in creating less alienating environments, and some of the smaller schools may suffer other negative side-effects of overcoming alienation, working towards less alienated schools appears a necessary goal for student individuality, involvement, harmony, and integration.

IX. REFERENCES

- Abramowitz, Susan
1979 Private High Schools: A Descriptive Profile and Comparison with Public High Schools. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April 8-12. 50p. ED 172 358.
- Abramowitz, Susan, and Tenenbaum, E.
1978 High School '77: A Survey of Public Secondary School Principals. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education.
- Adkisson, Rose Marie
1981 "Declassified EMH Students Make Gains." Integrated Education 18, 6:20-22.
- Allport, Gordon W.
1954 The Nature of Prejudice. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Arnove, Robert F., and Strout, Toby
1978 Alternative Schools for Disruptive Youth. Indiana School of Education, September. 70p. ED 162 413.
- Asner, Martha R. and Broschart, James, eds.
1978 Violent Schools--Safe Schools: The Safe School Study Report to the Congress. Vol I. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office. 357p. ED 149 464.
- Aspira of America, Inc.
1979 Trends in Segregation of Hispanic Students in Major School Districts Having Large Hispanic Enrollment: Ethnographic Case Studies. Vol. 2. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education.
- Barr, Robert T.
1981 "Alternatives for the Eighties: A Second Decade of Development." Phi Delta Kappan 62, 8 (April):570-573.
- Barr, Robert, Colston, Bruce, and Parret, William
1977 "The Effectiveness of Alternative Public Schools: An Analysis of Six School Evaluations," Viewpoints in Teaching and Learning (Bulletin of the School of Education, Indiana University) 53, 4 (July):1-30.
- Beckum, Leonard
1979 Desegregation/Integration: Help or Hindrance in Overcoming Black School Failure. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA, April. 24p. ED 177 267.

Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education
1979 Giving Youth a Better Chance: Options for Education, Work, and Service. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Coleman, James et al.

1966 Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.. ED 012 275.

Coleman, James et al.

1980 Public and Private Schools. Report for the National Center for Educational Statistics, September 2, preliminary draft, National Opinion Research Center. 340p. ED 197 503.

"Controversies: High School and Beyond"

1982 A series of articles on Public and Private Schools, including: James Coleman, Sally Kilgore and Thomas Hoffer, "Public and Private Schools," 4-9; Diane Ravitch, "What Makes a Good School?" 10-11; Gail E. Thomas, "Neither Direction Nor Alternatives," 11-14; Robert L. Crain and Willis D. Hawley, "Standards of Research," 14-21. In Society. 19,2 (January/February):4-21,

Cusick, Philip

1973 Inside High School. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Doob, Heather

1977 Evaluations of Alternative Schools. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.

Duke, Daniel, and Muzio, Irene

1978 "How Effective are Alternative Schools? A Review of Recent Evaluations and Reports." Teachers College Record 79,3 (February): 461-484.

"Evidence, Analysis and Unanswered Questions"

1981 A series of critiques of Public and Private Schools, including: Richard Murnane, "Evidence, Analysis and Unanswered Questions," 483-489; Jon Mills, Henry Braddock II, "The Issue is Still Equality of Educational Opportunity," 490-496; Anthony S. Bryk, "Disciplined Inquiry or Policy Argument," 497-509; Chester Finn, Jr., "Why Public and Private Schools Matter," 510-514; James W. Guthrie and Ami Zusman, "Unasked Questions," 515-518; Barbara L. Heyns, "Policy Implications of the Public and Private School Debate," 519-525; James Coleman, Thomas Hoffer and Sally Kilgore, "Questions and Answers: Our Response," 526-545. In Harvard Educational Review 51,4 (November):483-545.

Felice, L.G., and Richardson, R.L.

1977 "The Effects of Desegregation on Minority Student Dropout Rates." Integrated Education 15,6:47-50.

- Friedenberg, Edgar Z.
1963 Coming of Age in America. New York: Vintage.
- Gold, Martin
1977 Scholastic Experiences, Self-Esteem and Delinquent Behavior: A Theory for Alternate Schools. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research. Mimeographed. 56p. ED 157 181.
- Gordon, Edmund W.
1976 A Comparative Study of Quality Education. Final report for National Institute of Education under grant no. NE-G-00-3-0156, Project 3-1495. New York: Institute for Urban and Minority Education, Teachers College, Columbia University. ED 128 546.
- Gottfredson, Gary D., and Daiger, Denise C.
1979 Disruption in Six Hundred Schools. Baltimore, MD: Center for Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University, November. 262p. ED 183 701.
- Grannis, Joseph C.
1967 "The School as a Model of Society." Harvard Graduate School of Education Bulletin 12:14-27.
- Greeley, Andrew M.
1982 Catholic High Schools and Minority Students. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.
- Hawley, Willis D.
1979 "Getting the Facts Straight About the Effects of School Desegregation." Educational Leadership 36,5 (February):314-321.
- Henderson, Ronald D., and von Euler, Mary
1981 What Research and Experience Teach Us About Desegregating Large Northern Cities. Washington, D.C.: Clearinghouse for Civil Rights Research, Catholic University, January 28. 14p.
- Hirschi, Travis
1969 Causes of Delinquency. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Ianni, Francis A.J., and Reuss-Ianni, Elizabeth
1979 "School Crime and the Social Order of the School." IRCD Bulletin 14,1. (A publication of the Institute for Urban and Minority Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, NY.) 12p. ED 177 256.
- Jencks, Christopher et al.
1972 Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America. New York: Basic Books.

- Krahl, George B.
1977 Alternative Education: Current State of the Art. 19p. ED 146 708.
- Levin, Henry M.
1976 "A New Model of School Effectiveness." In Schooling and Achievement in American Society, edited by William H. Sewell et al.. pp.267-290. New York: Academic Press.
- Liebrader, Myron
1977 Alternative Education: Mini-Schools, Sub Schools, Schools Within a School. Ridgewood, NY: Grover Cleveland High School. Mimeographed. 14p. ED 136 638.
- Massimo, Joseph L., and Shore, Milton F.
1963 "The Effectiveness of a Comprehensive, Vocationally-Oriented Psychotherapeutic Program for Adolescent Delinquent Boys.". American Journal of Orthopsychiatry 33 (July):634-642.
- Newmann, Fred M.
1981 "Reducing Student Alienation in High Schools: Implications of Theory." Harvard Educational Review 51,4 (November):546-564.
- Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
1980 Delinquency Prevention through Alternative Education. (Part of "Program Announcement: Prevention of Delinquency Through Alternative Education," a request for proposals from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.) Washington, D.C.: Department of Justice, February. 62p. ED 183 707.
- Page, Ellis B., and Keith, Timothy Z.
1981 "Effect of U.S. Private Schools: A Technical Analysis of Two Recent Claims." Educational Researcher 10,7 (August/September):7-17.
- Raywid, Mary Anne
1981 "The First Decade of Public School Alternatives." Phi Delta Kappan 62,8 (April):551-554.
- Raywid, Mary Anne
1982 Evaluation of Alternative Education. Hempstead, NY: Project on Alternatives in Education, Hofstra University. Mimeographed. 10p.
- Rosenthal, R., and Jacobson, L.
1968 Pygmalion in the Classroom: Teacher Expectations and Pupils' Intellectual Development. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Rossell, Christine H., et al.
1981 Volume 5: A Review of the Empirical Research on Desegregation: Community Response, Race Relations, Academic Achievement, and Resegregation. Center for Education and Human Development Policy, Institute for Public Policy Studies, Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University, April.

- Rutter, Michael, et al.
1979 Fifteen Thousand Hours: Secondary Schools and their Effects on Children. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Schofield, J.W., and Sagar, H.A.
1977 "Peer Interaction in an Integrated Middle School." Sociometry 40:130.
- Schweinhart, L.J., and Weikart, D.P.
1980 Young Children Grow Up: The Effects of the Perry Preschool Program on Youths Through Age 15. Monograph 7 of the High/Scope Educational Research Foundation. Ypsilanti, MI: The High/Scope Press.
- Smith, Vernon H.
1974 Alternative Schools: The Development of Options in Public Education. Lincoln, NE: Professional Educators Publications.
- Smith, Vernon, Barr, Robert, and Burke, Daniel
1976 Alternatives in Education. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.
- Snow, R.E.
1969 "Unfinished Pygmalion." Contemporary Psychology 14:197-199.
- Stake, R.E., and Easley, J.A.
1978 Case Studies in Science Education. Washington, D.C.: National Science Foundation.
- St. John, Nancy
1975 School Desegregation Outcomes for Children. New York: Wiley and Sons.
- Swidler, Ann
1979 Organization without Authority: Dilemmas of Social Control in Free Schools. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Thorndike, Robert L.
1968 "Review of R. Rosenthal and L. Jacobson, Pygmalion in the Classroom." American Educational Research Journal 5:708-711.
- Weinberg, Meyer
1977 Minority Students: A Research Appraisal. (Department of Health, Education and Welfare, National Institute of Education.) Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office. 398p. ED 137 483.
- Yoshida, Roldan, MacMillan, Donald L., and Meyers, C. Edward
1976 "Classification of Minority Group EMR Students in California: Student Achievement and Adjustment." In Mainstreaming and the Minority Child, edited by Reginald L. Jones, pp.215-234. Washington, D.C.: Leadership Training Institute/Special Education. ED 133 941.